



March 22, 2002

Mr. John Steiner
Division Chief - Law Department
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1546
Austin, Texas 78767-1546

OR2002-1446

Dear Mr. Steiner:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 160764.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for nine categories of information related to a zoning investigation. You state that the city has no information responsive to category 9 of the request. The Public Information Act does not ordinarily require a governmental body to obtain information not in its possession. Open Records Decision Nos. 558 (1990), 499 (1988). You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted documents contain information that falls within the purview of section 552.022(a)(3). Section 552.022(a)(3) provides that information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body is not excepted from required disclosure unless they are made expressly confidential by law. The submitted information includes a payment receipt from the city. The receipt is a voucher as contemplated by section 552.022(a)(3), and is therefore public information not excepted from public disclosure, unless the information is expressly made confidential under other law. You contend that section 552.103 of the Government Code makes this information confidential. However, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and is therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex.

App.--Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Thus, the receipt must be released to the requestor.

We will next address your section 552.103 argument for the remainder of the submitted information. Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). You inform us that the information at issue relates to a violation of the zoning provisions of the Austin City Code. You state that the city anticipates filing a criminal charge in Municipal Court with respect to the zoning violation. Based upon your representations and our review of the submitted documents, we find that, in this case, litigation is reasonably anticipated and the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. We conclude, therefore, that section 552.103 is applicable to the portion of the submitted information that is not subject to the purview of section 552.022.

However, it appears that a large portion of the submitted information has already been seen by the opposing party or parties to the anticipated litigation. Generally, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no

section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982). Additionally, with respect to the submitted information, we note that the records include copies of city ordinances, a telephone directory, and an appraisal district plat map. These documents must be released to the requestor as they already exist in the public domain. Thus, with the exception of the information that is available in the public domain, information subject to release under section 552.022, and information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party, the city may withhold the submitted information from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/seg

Ref: ID# 160764

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John D. Jacks
Gray & Becker
900 West Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-2210
(w/o enclosures)